REMARKS

Claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-20.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,172,669 (hereinafter Murphy). The rejection is respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 are neither taught nor suggested by Murphy.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, in part:

> b) an application program of said computer system making a call to request a display attribute for an object to be displayed on said display screen;
> c) in response to said request, <u>indexing a table with said flag and an object identifier</u> to obtain a display attribute, wherein said object identifier identifies said object, and wherein *said table* <u>is located externally of said application program and</u> *comprises a list of said object identifiers* and a plurality of display attribute lists, each of said display attribute lists having a display attribute associated with each of said object identifiers

Claim 1 recites that a table comprises a list of object identifiers. Claim 1 further recites that the table is indexed with an object identifier. Claim 1 further recites that the object identifier identifies the object to be displayed. Referring to Figure 9, an exemplary table is illustrated with a column for object identifiers, such as, for example, button border, menu frame, menu fill, and menu foreground.

Murphy fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. First, Murphy fails to teach or suggest a table comprising a list of object identifiers, as claimed.

In contrast, Murphy teaches a color look up table (CLUT) that <u>maps pixel data into red, green, and blue (RGB) component values</u> (col. 2, lines 34-36; col. 5, lines 45-53). Thus, it is Applicants' understanding that the CLUT table in Murphy comprises <u>values for pixel data</u> and a mapping to another value. Hence, Applicants do not understand the CLUT in Murphy to comprise <u>object identifiers</u>, as claimed.

Second, Murphy fails to teach or suggest indexing a table with an object identifier, as claimed. In contrast, Murphy teaches inputting pixel data to the CLUT. Referring to Figure 11 of Murphy, data stored in the video line buffer 44 is converted or <u>transformed</u> by the CLUT 66 into a 24-bit RGB value. Murphy discloses that the data in the video buffer may comprise 16 bits per pixel (col. 9, lines 27-38). Applicants do not understand inputting video data (e.g. pixel data) into the CLUT to be indexing a table with an object identifier, as claimed. This is so because Murphy is not producing a display value <u>based on the identity of an object</u>. Rather, Applicants understand Murphy to teach <u>converting or transforming data based on its value</u>. Thus, Applicants understand Murphy to teach a conversion based on a <u>data value</u>.

Moreover, Murphy discloses that the CLUT may be designed in accordance with the <u>format of the pixel data</u>, as well as the particular color palette designated by a user or application (col. 2, lines 38-40). The cited passage further shows that Murphy fails to disclose or suggest an object based table, wherein the table is indexed by an object identifier, as claimed. Rather, Murphy discloses that the CLUT may be designed in accordance with the <u>format</u>

of the pixel data. Further, Applicants to do not understand allowing the CLUT to be designed in accordance with the particular color palette designated by a user or application to be having a table that comprises object identifiers, as claimed.

For the foregoing rationale, it is respectfully asserted that independent Claim 1 overcomes the references cited of record and is therefore allowable.

Claims 10 and 13

Claims 10 and 13 contain similar limitations as Claim 1. For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, it is respectfully asserted that independent Claims 10 and 13 overcome the references cited of record and are therefore allowable.

Claim 4

Claim 4 recites:
> The method of Claim 1, wherein one of said display attribute lists has all of its associated display attributes as being <u>colors which are substantially different from each other</u>, such that debugging said application program is facilitated.

It is Applicants' understanding that Murphy fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitation of the display attributes being colors that are substantially different from each other, such that debugging the application program is facilitated. For the foregoing rationale, it is respectfully asserted that Claim 4 overcomes the references cited of record and is therefore allowable.

Claim 5

Claim 5 recites:
> The method of claim 1, further comprising the step of said <u>application program changing at least one of the display attributes</u> in at least one of said display attribute lists.

Murphy discloses the use of multiple lookup tables to accommodate different data formats and color palettes (col. 9, lines 24-27). However, it is Applicants' understanding that Murphy fails to teach or suggest the claimed limitation of the <u>application program changing at least one of the display attributes</u> in at least one of the display attribute lists. For the foregoing rationale, it is respectfully asserted that Claim 5 overcomes the references cited of record and is therefore allowable.

Claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11 - 12, and 14 - 20 depend from Claims 1, 10, and 13, which are believed to be allowable. As such, it is respectfully asserted that the rejection of Claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11 - 12, and 14 - 20 has been overcome.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims is requested.

Based on the arguments and amendments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 10/14 , 2002

Ronald M. Pomerenke
Registration No. 43,009

Address:

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

Telephone:

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile